

While I strongly support passage of the Senate bill, I note that some provisions in the House bill are not included in this bill.

For example, the House bill would have adjusted the disability requirement and cost-of-living annuities of four territorial judges, thereby reducing existing inequities between them and other term judges such as magistrate and bankruptcy judges.

The House bill would have changed the annual lead limit for the judicial branch and adjusted the pay scale.

Finally, the House bill would have allowed four Federal Judicial Center Division directors to receive a salary commensurate with their responsibilities and on par with similar AO personnel.

I intend to introduce new legislation that will include these provisions from my version of the Federal Judiciary Administrative Improvements Act, but let me be clear that passage of the legislation before us today is an important step to improving our Federal judiciary and helping it function in the most efficient way. This legislation is bipartisan and noncontroversial. It passed the Senate under unanimous consent and has the full backing of the Judicial Conference. I ask my colleagues to join me in supporting this important legislation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the purpose of S. 1782 is to implement noncontroversial administrative provisions that the Judicial Conference and the House Judiciary Committee believe are necessary to improve the operations of the Federal judiciary and provide justice for the American people. The bill retains most of the content of H.R. 3632, which we passed in October of 2009.

The Judicial Conference is the policymaking body of the Federal judiciary and through its committee system evaluates court operations. The conference endorses all the provisions in this bill.

S. 1782 affects a wide range of judicial branch programs and operations, including those pertaining to financial administration, process improvements, and personnel administration. The bill incorporates five separate items.

First, it clarifies that senior judges must satisfy minimum work thresholds to participate in court government matters, including the selection of magistrates.

Second, the bill eliminates the references to divisions and counties in the statutory description of the Judicial District of North Dakota, which enables the court to better distribute the workload between two active district judges and reduce travel for litigants in the northern central area of the district.

Third, it authorizes the Statement of Reasons that judges must issue upon sentencing to be filed separately with the court. Current law requires that

the statement be bundled with other information in the case distributed to the Sentencing Commission, where it can be difficult to maintain a seal related to confidential information.

Fourth, it specifies that the Federal Pretrial Service officers can provide the same services to juveniles as they do for adult offenders, such as drug treatment.

And, finally, it applies an inflationary index to the threshold amount requiring approval by the chief judge of reimbursements for the cost of hiring expert witnesses and conducting investigation for indigent defendants.

The dollar thresholds are statutorily fixed and erode over time. This means chief justices must devote greater time approving what are otherwise not genuine high-dollar requests.

Mr. Speaker, S. 1782 is necessary to improve the functioning of the U.S. courts, which will ultimately benefit the American people. This is a noncontroversial bill, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JOHNSON) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, S. 1782.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### EXPRESSING CONDOLENCES FOR CHATHAM COUNTY COURTHOUSE FIRE

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 1364) honoring the historic and community significance of the Chatham County Courthouse and expressing condolences to Chatham County and the town of Pittsboro for the fire damage sustained by the courthouse on March 25, 2010.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

#### H. RES. 1364

Whereas on March 5, 1881, the General Assembly of North Carolina approved legislation allowing the Board of Justices of Chatham County to replace the existing architecturally unsound Chatham County courthouse with a new facility and provided the county with construction bonds of up to \$12,000;

Whereas Thomas B. Womack designed the plans for the Chatham County Courthouse, and J. Bynum and William Lord London of Pittsboro, North Carolina, were awarded the construction contract;

Whereas on September 1, 1881, members of Columbus Lodge 102 laid the cornerstone of the new courthouse in Pittsboro, and on July 4, 1882, the new courthouse was completed;

Whereas the Chatham County Courthouse is a three-story brick structure with a two-story classical portico topped by a distinguishing three-stage cupola;

Whereas county courthouses are focal points of justice and the rule of law in communities across the country, and the Chatham County Courthouse serves as the central landmark of Pittsboro and Chatham County;

Whereas the historic Chatham County Courthouse was partially destroyed by a tragic fire that broke out on March 25, 2010, at approximately 4:15 p.m.;

Whereas firefighters, led by Chatham County Fire Marshal Thomas Bender, courageously fought the blaze and protected surrounding buildings from damage;

Whereas government officials of the North Carolina Administrative Office of the Courts, Chatham County, and the town of Pittsboro have worked tirelessly to ensure the continuity of judicial operations in Chatham County and to develop a plan to restore the courthouse; and

Whereas the North Carolina court system, Chatham County, and the town of Pittsboro experienced a significant and tragic loss as a result of the March 25, 2010 fire: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the House of Representatives—

(1) expresses condolences to the North Carolina court system, Chatham County, and the town of Pittsboro for the tragic loss of the Chatham County Courthouse;

(2) commends the heroic actions of the Chatham County firefighters and first responders who worked tirelessly to combat the Courthouse fire, minimize the damage to the Courthouse and the historic materials contained therein, and protect the public;

(3) recognizes the community significance of the Courthouse as a cornerstone of justice and the rule of law in Chatham County; and

(4) recognizes the impact that more than a century of landmark court decisions has made on the judicial system of the Town of Pittsboro, Chatham County, and North Carolina.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JOHNSON) and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. ROONEY) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the resolution under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution honors the Chatham County Courthouse in Pittsboro, North Carolina. This historic courthouse was recently destroyed by a fire on March 25, 2010. It took more than 100 courageous firefighters to put out the blaze.

The town of Pittsboro, population around 3,000, has many important historical attractions. These include numerous 19th century buildings, an old-fashioned soda shop on the main street, and a number of antique stores. And for over 100 years, Chatham County Courthouse stood in the middle of town.

The courthouse was originally built in 1881 and was restored in 1991 to its

original appearance. Local residents regarded the courthouse as the heart of the county and as a symbol of their community.

This resolution expresses our condolences to the town of Pittsboro and all of Chatham County, North Carolina, for their loss of this historic and significant building, and I urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I support House Resolution 1364. This resolution honors the historic and community significance of the Chatham County Courthouse and expresses condolences to Chatham County and the town of Pittsboro for the fire damage sustained by the courthouse on March 25, 2010.

The cornerstone of the Chatham County Courthouse was laid in 1881. The courthouse was completed in 1882. For nearly 130 years, justice and the rule of law preserved this three-story brick courthouse. It stood as the central landmark and community gathering-place for Pittsboro and Chatham County. It helped form the identity and independence of the people of Chatham County.

On March 25, 2010, the Chatham County Courthouse was partially destroyed by a tragic fire. Firefighters and emergency responders fought courageously to save the structure and the historic archives within it. They also protected the public and surrounding buildings from damage.

State, county, and city officials have since worked to ensure that the administration of justice continues in Chatham County. They also plan to restore the courthouse.

This resolution expresses condolences to the people of Chatham County and the town of Pittsboro for their historic loss. The resolution commends the heroic work of the firefighters and first responders, and it recognizes the significance of the courthouse to the community and to the administration of justice for more than a century. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this resolution.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PRICE) for such time as he may consume.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for yielding and rise in support of H. Res. 1364, recognizing and remembering the Chatham County Courthouse in Pittsboro, North Carolina.

At 4:15 p.m. on March 25 of this year, the upper portion of the courthouse caught fire. The blaze eventually destroyed much of the building, taking with it over 130 years of history and a source of pride and appreciation for Chatham County residents and visitors.

The county the courthouse serves is divided between the Second and Fourth Congressional Districts, and I am

pleased to join my colleague, Representative BOB ETHERIDGE, and other North Carolina colleagues today in lamenting the serious damage to this landmark structure.

The Chatham County Courthouse dates back to September 1, 1881, when members of the Columbus Lodge 102 laid its cornerstone at the historic town center of Pittsboro. The building, which is known for its two-story classical portico, topped by a three-stage cupola, was designed by Thomas B. Womack, following the passage of legislation in the North Carolina General Assembly to provide the county with construction bonds of up to \$12,000.

The building was completed less than 1 year later, on Independence Day of 1882, and has served ever since as a landmark to visitors and residents alike and a symbol of constancy to the broader community.

Although the building will be rebuilt in time and many of the records lost will be recreated, I grieve with the Chatham County community today for the loss of this courthouse. County courthouses are the cornerstones of justice and the rule of law in our communities; but we know they attain a greater significance, a significance larger than their day-to-day role.

I also would like to recognize the local first responders who responded to the fire for their heroic action in controlling the blaze and ensuring the safety of court personnel. Thanks to their efforts and a working fire alarm system, there were no injuries or fatalities as a result of this fire.

I also commend the North Carolina Administrative Office of the Courts and the Chatham County and town of Pittsboro governments, which have worked tirelessly to ensure the continuity of judicial operations and to develop a plan to restore the courthouse.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague, Mr. ETHERIDGE, who represents the town of Pittsboro and the majority of Chatham County in Congress, for his leadership on this resolution. I join with him in extending condolences to the community and expressing our hope and expectation that efforts to rebuild the portions of the building that were destroyed and to restore the archives will be swift and successful.

□ 1545

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JOHNSON) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 1364.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make

the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

#### KATIE SEPICH ENHANCED DNA COLLECTION ACT OF 2010

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4614) to amend part E of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to provide for incentive payments under the Edward Byrne Memorial Justice Assistance Grant program for States to implement minimum and enhanced DNA collection processes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 4614

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

#### SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Katie Sepich Enhanced DNA Collection Act of 2010".

#### SEC. 2. INCENTIVE PAYMENTS UNDER THE BYRNE GRANTS PROGRAM FOR STATES TO IMPLEMENT MINIMUM AND ENHANCED DNA COLLECTION PROCESSES.

Section 505 of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3755) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(i) PAYMENT INCENTIVES FOR STATES TO IMPLEMENT MINIMUM AND ENHANCED DNA COLLECTION PROCESSES.—

“(1) PAYMENT INCENTIVES.—

“(A) BONUS FOR MINIMUM DNA COLLECTION PROCESS.—Subject to subparagraph (B), in the case of a State that receives funds for a fiscal year (beginning with fiscal year 2011) under this subpart and has implemented a minimum DNA collection process and uses such process for such year, the amount of funds that would otherwise be allocated under this subpart to such State for such fiscal year shall be increased by 5 percent.

“(B) BONUS FOR ENHANCED DNA COLLECTION PROCESS.—In the case of a State that receives funds for a fiscal year (beginning with fiscal year 2011) under this subpart and has implemented an enhanced DNA collection process and uses such process for such year, the amount of funds that would otherwise be allocated under this subpart to such State for such fiscal year shall be increased by 10 percent.

“(2) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this subsection:

“(A) MINIMUM DNA COLLECTION PROCESS.—The term ‘minimum DNA collection process’ means, with respect to a State, a process under which the Combined DNA Index System (CODIS) of the Federal Bureau of Investigation is searched at least one time against samples from the following individuals who are at least 18 years of age:

“(i) Such individuals who are arrested for, charged with, or indicted for a criminal offense under State law that consists of murder or voluntary manslaughter or any attempt to commit murder or voluntary manslaughter.

“(ii) Such individuals who are arrested for, charged with, or indicted for a criminal offense under State law that has an element